DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 302 CG 011 774

AUTHOR Fahrer, Robert F.; And Others
TITLE A Needs Assessment Survey in Washington State University's Residence Halls.
INSTITUTION Washington State Univ., Pullman. Dept. of Residence Living.
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Dormitories; Food Service; Higher Education; *Life Style; Models; *Needs Assessment; *Planning; *Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Recreational Activities; Resource Allocations; Student Government; *Student Needs

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to begin assessing perceived needs of Washington State University students living in this institution's residence halls, the Department of Residence Living sought the responses to a 106-question survey. The general residential living areas assessed were: Personal Development; Residence Hall and General University Social and Recreational Environment; University and Residence Hall Policies; Housing: Facilities, Maintenance, Vending, Services; and Financial Aid and Employment Opportunities. One thousand nine hundred sixty nine (1,969) completed usable questionnaires for a response rate of 49.2%. In general, men and women responded similarly in most areas studied. When examined by hall type, respondents from coeducational halls (COED) did not respond as predicted in a number of areas: noise, finding help with personal problems, less satisfaction with hall government are a few. Small Single Sex (S.S.S.) halls appear to be able to overcome obvious physical problems with a sense of community that does not seem as strong in the Large Single Sex (L.S.S.) or COED halls. Although this study is college-specific, it could be used effectively as a model for other residence halls interested in ascertaining and responding to students' needs. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145302

A NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY IN WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY'S RESIDENCE HALLS

By Robert F. Fahrer
George A. Bettas
Barbara T. Rexwinkel

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert F. Fahrer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Department of Residence Living
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

November, 1976

CG011774

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
Section	
1. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT	5
2. RESIDENCE HALL AND GENERAL UNIVERSITY SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL ENVIRONMENT	11
3. UNIVERSITY AND RESIDENCE HALL POLICIES	18
4. HOUSING: FACILITIES, MAINTENANCE, VENDING, SERVICES	23
5. FINANCIAL AID AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES	33
DISCUSSION	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Demographic Characteristics	3
2.	Personal Development	9
3.	Residence Hall and General University Social and Recreational Environment	14
4.	University and Residence Hall Policies	21
5.	Housing: Facilities, Maintenance, Vending, Services	27
6.	Financial Aid and Employment Opportunities	36

SUMMARY

In an attempt to begin assessing perceived needs of Washington State University students living in this institution's residence halls, the Department of Residence Living sought the responses to a 106-question survey. The general residential living areas assessed were: Personal Development; Residence Hall and General University Social and Recreational Environment; University and Residence Hall Policies; Housing: Facilities, Maintenance, Vending, Services; and Financial Aid and Employment Opportunities. One thousand nine hundred sixty nine (1,969) completed usable questionnaires for a response rate of 49.2%.

In general, men and women responded similarly in most areas studied. However, it was evident that additional emphasis needs to be given to women in enabling them to become financially self-supporting and in providing recreational programs equal in breadth and depth to the men's programs. In certain physical housing and food service areas, responses from both men and women were poorer than anticipated.

When examined by hall type, respondents from coeducational halls (COED) did not respond as predicted in a number of areas: noise, finding help with personal problems, less satisfaction with hall government are a few. Small Single Sex (S.S.S.) halls appear to be able to overcome obvious physical problems with a sense of community that does not seem as strong in the Large Single Sex (L.S.S.) or COED halls.

INTRODUCTION

An attempt to determine perceptions of students in Washington State University's residence halls and to determine needs which would be addressed by students and staff alike was undertaken in November, 1976. The first Residence Living Needs Assessment survey was an aspect of a more comprehensive community survey funded by an ACTION grant in the spring of 1975. Dr. William Brown, then coordinator of research for the Student Services Division, worked with staff and students through the Department of Residence Living to prepare and pilot this survey prior to the November, 1976 general dissemination.

The five areas of consideration listed in the Table of Contents were those agreed upon by staff and students who developed the instrument. In addition, this survey asked a substantial number of questions regarding hospital facilities, services, and possible sites. Other responses concerned with needs for additional housing in Pullman, a centralized telephone and walk-up student information center, and a WSU-Moscow bus service were not reported. Responses are available from the Student Counseling Center or the Department of Residence Living.

Recommendations are provided at the end of each section of this report.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Number	Percent
Class		
Freshman	1,018	51.9
Sophomore	532	27.1
Junior	244	12.4
Senior	137	7.0
Graduate	30	1.5
Sex		
Male	813	43.4
Female	1,152	58.6
Hall Type		
Small Single Sex Halls (23.5% of total number of respondents)		
Coman (F)	75	17.2
Community (F)	42	9.7
Davis (F)	57	13.1
Duncan Dunn (F)	48	11.0
McCroskey (F)	52	7.4
Scott (M)	28	5.3
Stevens (F)	38	11.1
Stimson (M)	5	1.5
Waller (M)	84	24.6
Wilmer (F)	33	9.6
COED Halls (26.1% of total number of respondents)		
Neill	80	11.3
Orton	251	35.8
Streit-Perham	182	53.2

TABLE 1--Continued

	Number	Percent
Hall Type		
Large Single Sex Halls (52.5% of total number of respondents)		
Gannon-Goldsworthy (M)	213	49.0
Kruegel-McAllister (F)	162	23.0
Regents (F)	157	22.4
Rogers (M)	171	32.3
Stephenson East (F)	102	19.2
Stephenson North (F)	171	32.3
Stephenson South (M)	58	10.9

NOTE: No frequencies are reported in the tables for each of the major areas studied. However, for general information, an average of 795 men and 1,122 women were available for obtaining the percentages in the Male/Female portion, and 435, 510, and 1,024 average number of respondents were available from the Small Single Sex, COED, and Large Single Sex Halls. Exact figures can be obtained from the Department of Residence Living.

1. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

COED hall respondents had the least positive responses and S.S.S. hall respondents had the most positive responses to the question about residence hall opportunity for discussing and finding help with personal problems. In addition, one third of the respondents were undecided about the opportunity for discovery and finding help with personal problems. At the same time, contact time with residence hall staff (RA, Head Resident) was rated as highly satisfactory (questions 81, 82). It is highly possible that residence hall residents do not see the Resident Assistant as being available to help with personal problems. It is also possible that residence hall staff should be spending a greater proportion of their energies and time in developing their skills to enable them to deal effectively with residents' problems.

Questions 83-87 are concerned with Chickering's developmental vectors (from Chickerings' book Education and Identity) and the respondents' degree of satisfaction with the residential environment's contribution to those developmental vectors. A great majority (73%) of the respondents believed that the residential environment satisfactorily assisted them in becoming autonomous. A slightly lower percentage believed that the residential environment assisted them satisfactorily in increasing self confidence (64%), establishing a sense of identity (60%), and managing emotions (59%). Less than 50% were satisfied with the residential environment's contribution to their achieving competence. Over one third of the entire sample were undecided on this item (38%).

Sex of Respondent

Men and women respondents agree and disagree about the same things. The responses to all questions indicate a slightly greater acknowledgment by women than men that living in a residence hall has contributed to their personal development and that they can find assistance (from peers and/or staff) with personal problems.

General Comment

Regarding questions 81 and 82, it appears that the time staff spend with their residents does not adequately include problem solving and/or problem referral.

Recommendations

1. Attempt to determine why COED halls were much less satisfied with the residence hall environment's provision for discussing and finding help with personal problems. (This same question should be addressed in all of the halls through staff and hall government.) Means should be actively sought to provide assistance in the residential environment in this general area.

2. Staff development for Head Residents and Resident Assistants should emphasize the "helper" role, including specific problem recognition, problem solving and referral techniques.

3. A significant minority of those sampled responded in the "undecided" and "unsatisfactory" areas in questions 83-87 (Chickering's Developmental Vectors). More assistance in developmental (personal) growth should be given residents through a variety of means: expanding the Residence Living/Counseling Center's Group on Groups, microcounseling, workshops, and general developmental programming in the residence halls. A first step might be that of specifically surveying students' perceived developmental needs in each of the developmental vectors using the list on the following page. From resident responses, a prioritized list of developmental programming objectives can be specified.

4. Resident Assistants could lead discussions of developmental concepts on a floor wide basis, i.e., programs on Building and Maintaining Relationships, or bring resource people to the floor from various agencies, i.e., Counseling Center, Career Service and Placement Center, Women's Center, that exist for personal development.

Developmental Vectors and Specific Growth Areas

I. Developing autonomy--self reliance

- A. Resolve dependency relationships
- B. Develop ability to confront others
- C. Develop self-responsibility
- D. Learn to relate to the Power Structure

II. Establishing total identity

- A. Sexual identity
- B. Racial identity
- C. Personal worth
- D. Self-awareness
- E. Cultural identity
- F. Spiritual identity
- G. Economic identity
- H. Role conflict clarification

III. Freeing interpersonal relationships

- A. Developing capacity for intimacy
- B. Confronting self and other assertive behavior
- C. Conflict resolution

IV. Managing emotions

- A. Sex
- B. Aggression
- C. Alienation
- D. Identification of affective and cognitive dimensions of self-ability to articulate
- E. Develop appropriate expressions of emotions (i.e., fear, love)

V. Developing integrity--developing personal value system

- A. Awareness and justification of values
- B. Acceptance of others' values
- C. Flexibility to change

VI. Clarifying purposes

- A. Life work--career decisions
- B. Marriage and family
- C. Academic goals
- D. Existential life purpose

VII. Achieving Competency

A. Cognitive area
B. Physical skills
C. Effective area
D. General skills

1. Communication skills
2. Academic knowledge
3. Decision making
4. Study skills
5. Reason and logic
6. Psycho-motor skills

SOURCE: ACPA Commission III

TABLE 2

PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
81. Rate the residence hall provision for opportunity for discussing and finding help with personal problems.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	26	20	26	27	27.2	25.1
Undecided	33	28	36	31	34.6	31.1
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	41	50	35	39	38.2	43.8
82. Rate the contact time with residence hall staff (RA, Head Resident).						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	17	15	15	18	14.1	18.3
Undecided	15	12	13	16	17.3	12.4
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	69	70	71	64	68.6	69.3
Living in a residence hall has contributed to:						
83. Achieving competence.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	16	15	17	15	17.4	14.3
Undecided	38	32	43	35	38.7	36.9
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	47	50	38	48	43.9	48.8

TABLE 2--Continued

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
84. Managing my emotions.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	16	16	16	15	17.2	15.0
Undecided	25	23	20	23	26.5	24.4
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	59	56	54	58	56.3	60.6
85. Helping me become autonomous (independent).						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	13	14	13	13	17.6	10.4
Undecided	14	12	19	12	17.2	12.0
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	73	70	66	73	65.2	77.6
86. Establishing a sense of identity.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	18	19	19	17	19.2	17.1
Undecided	22	20	24	21	24.9	19.9
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	60	58	56	60	55.9	60.6
87. My self-confidence.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	16	18	14	15	16.9	14.9
Undecided	20	15	23	20	22.9	18.3
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	64	62	61	63	60.2	66.8

15

2. RESIDENCE HALL AND GENERAL UNIVERSITY SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Questions 71-80 allow a comparison of residence halls with general university opportunities on three topics: making dates (finding dates), making friends, and informal gathering places. Most significantly, residence halls apparently provide a satisfactory or very satisfactory environment for making friends (question 72). S.S.S. hall respondents, followed by L.S.S. hall respondents have a more difficult time with making (finding) dates (question 71).

The general university environment provides a greater opportunity for dating for respondents from these two hall types. COED respondents are more satisfied with the opportunities for dating from within their halls, but perhaps this satisfaction percentage (51%) should be higher given the coeducational nature of the hall. Concerning opportunities for dating in both residence halls and the general university environment, the number of undecided respondents was fairly large (23% and 21% respectively), as was the unsatisfactory category (32% and 26% respectively).

Respondents from S.S.S. halls were more satisfied about residence hall governments' effectiveness in meeting students' needs than were respondents from the other two hall types (questions 75 and 76).

While campus recreational facilities and intramural program were rated by respondents from all hall types as satisfactory, recreational opportunities in residence halls were rated as unsatisfactory by 31% of all respondents (questions 89-91).

Extracurricular educational programs (political speakers union, lecture artist series, art exhibits) are generally regarded as satisfactory by respondents (71%). The opportunity provided by the general university environment for development of social, artistic, and creative talents meet with a far less positive response: only 45% gave satisfactory responses, while the combined undecided and unsatisfactory responses were very large (questions 77 and 88).

Sex of Respondent

Women were generally more satisfied than men regarding making friends in the residence halls and general university environment (questions 72, 79). In all, the total university environment seems conducive to the development of friendships.

Student government in residence halls and at the university level (questions 76, 89) brought about a larger undecided response from women than from men, and less of an unsatisfactory response.

Women are far less satisfied with residence hall recreational facilities than men (54.1% and 75.7%, respectively), but are far more satisfied with the campus-wide recreational facilities than men (76.1% and 42.8%, respectively) (questions 89, 90). Women are less satisfied than men with the campus intramural program (question 91) and with recreational program of equipment loans, crafts, and unstructured recreation than men (question 92).

Recommendations

1. Since at least one third of the respondents were either undecided or dissatisfied regarding informal gathering places both at the residence hall and university level, ways to increase the availability of informal gathering places to students should be explored.

For example, how can the Koinonia House and Butch's Den be utilized more effectively? How can ASWSU, RHA, and other student organizations, as well as the university, develop coffeehouses in strategic areas of the campus? How can physical environments be altered with the participation and cooperation of the university administration and students?

2. Student government organizations in each residence hall as well as RHA and ASWSU should:

   a. Review its priorities in meeting students' needs.

   b. Review and improve means of disseminating information to constituencies.

   c. Utilize the "Town Meeting" concept to enlist students and solicit from them their input regarding needs and means of solving some of the varied problems facing students and the university-at-large.

   d. A bimonthly or monthly "Campus Dialogue" should be considered for the leaders of the university, ASWSU officers, and leaders of the various major campus organizations on the campus television station, and the ASWSU President should consider a weekly EVERGREEN column to disseminate information.

3. Residence halls with limited recreational opportunities should strongly emphasize and publicize campus-wide recreational events. Additionally:

   a. Campus recreation leaders should be utilized in residence halls to provide guidance and general information.

   b. It might be worthwhile to consider a weekly 5-10 minute (or longer) spot on the campus radio or television station as a means by which information about campus recreational opportunities can be publicized.

   c. If space is not available for the same types of recreation in residence halls, perhaps, "crafts rooms" and games rooms could be set up in these halls.

4. Women's recreational programs at the residence hall level and intramural programs at the university level should be explored to insure comparability with the breadth and depth of men's programs.

5. Participative social, artistic and other creative activities need to be encouraged and opportunities developed more fully at all levels.

TABLE 3

RESIDENCE HALL AND GENERAL UNIVERSITY SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
71. Rate the degree to which your residence hall provides opportunity for making dates.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	32	41	21	33	32.8	31.6
Undecided	23	19	26	22	19.6	25.1
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	45	37	51	44	47.6	43.3
78. Rate the degree to which the general university environment provides opportunity for finding dates.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	26	26	25	26	26.2	26.6
Undecided	21	20	23	19	18.8	22.8
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	52	51	51	52	55.0	50.6
72. Rate the degree to which your residence hall provides opportunity for making friends.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	10	10	8	10	11.8	8.1
Undecided	7	6	6	7	8.3	5.5
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	84	82	85	81	79.9	86.4

79.	Rate the degree to which the general university environment provides opportunity for making friends.					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	14	13	13	15	15.2	13.2
	Undecided	10	10	11	9	10.8	9.2
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	76	75	75	75	74.0	77.6
73.	Rate the degree to which your residence hall provides informal gathering places.					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	26	18	31	26	27.9	24.7
	Undecided	8	5	10	9	10.6	6.3
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	66	75	58	64	61.5	69.0
80.	Rate the degree to which the general university environment provides informal gathering places.					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	18	13	17	19	20.2	16.1
	Undecided	14	14	14	13	16.5	11.4
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	69	70	68	66	63.3	72.5
75.	Rate residence hall student government on its effectiveness in meeting students' needs.					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	26	20	28	28	35.5	19.7
	Undecided	32	24	32	34	28.8	34.5
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	42	53	38	37	35.7	45.8

TABLE 3--Continued

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
76. Rate ASWSU student government on its effectiveness in meeting students' needs.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	29	24	31	28	38.7	21.2
Undecided	50	49	48	49	41.2	55.9
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	22	24	20	21	20.1	22.9
89. Rate recreational opportunities in the residence hall.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	31	31	29	31	26.3	34.4
Undecided	11	11	12	11	10.9	11.5
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	58	56	58	56	75.7	54.1
90. Rate campus recreational facilities in meeting your needs.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	12	8	13	13	14.3	10.6
Undecided	12	12	13	11	23.9	13.3
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	76	77	72	74	42.8	76.1
91. The intramural program at WSU is:						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	9	8	9	8	11.5	6.3
Undecided	21	26	21	18	12.8	27.0
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	70	63	67	72	75.7	66.7

92.	The recreational program of equipment loan, crafts and unstructured recreation provided by the residence hall is:					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	33	33	34	30	33.3	32.4
	Undecided	28	28	29	27	23.9	31.6
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	39	35	36	40	42.8	36.0
77.	Rate the environment the general university provides for participation in educational programs, such as political speakers union, lecture artist, art exhibits, etc.					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	11	11	11	10	12.8	9.0
	Undecided	19	18	18	18	20.0	17.8
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	71	69	70	70	67.2	73.2
88.	Rate the extent to which the general university environment provides opportunities to develop and use my social, artistic, and creative talents.					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	24	23	26	23	28.1	21.4
	Undecided	30	30	31	30	30.1	30.6
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	45	47	41	45	41.8	48.0

3. UNIVERSITY AND RESIDENCE HALL POLICIES

Hall Type

Forty per cent of the respondents from COED halls are dissatisfied with their noise policies, followed by 35% from L.S.S. halls and 19% in S.S.S. halls (question 67).

The university alcohol policy is more satisfactory in S.S.S. halls, while it is regarded as less satisfactory in COED and L.S.S. halls (question 68).

The university policy on "other drugs" is regarded as generally satisfactory, although a greater proportion of respondents are undecided on this policy than on the two preceding policy issues (question 69). Furthermore, COED respondents felt more strongly that this policy was unsatisfactory than did respondents from the other two hall types. Taken at face value, these responses indicate a majority satisfaction with this existing university policy. However, more information needs to be acquired concerning the below-mentioned points before any definitive conclusions can be made:

1. What is the frequency of use of various "other drugs" in each of the hall types?
2. Why did respondents from L.S.S. halls report such a high degree of satisfaction with the policy? Was it because there is a great deal of use that is not being controlled, or because there actually is very little use by the great majority which resulted in the high degree of satisfaction?
3. What are the dynamics behind the larger unsatisfactory response by those in COED halls?

The university's policy on visitation in residence halls is generally satisfactory, although a strong minority (26%) regardless of hall type rate it unsatisfactory.

General Comment

These were issues about which respondents had very definite opinions. There were very few "undecided" responses.

Sex of Respondent

The rules and/or policies regarding noise (question 67) are more acceptable to both males and females than the noise level where respondents resided (question 94). The (general) noise level is satisfactory only to approximately 50% of the respondents, an unsatisfactory level.

Men and women differed considerably on their perception of the appropriateness of the rules/policies regarding alcohol and other drugs (alcohol: 60% acceptable for women, 44% for men; other drugs: 70% for women, 60% for men).

Recommendations

1. Regarding noise, the Department of Residence Living should:

   a. Give priority emphasis to this issue during the next academic year by hall staff and governments, especially since dissatisfaction with noise level and study atmosphere is high and because the former may be linked causally to the latter in COED and L.S.S. halls;

   b. Determine which individual COED and L.S.S. halls appear to be having the greatest difficulty with noise and why;

   c. Make available some specific training to those staff (and possibly officers and floor representatives) on how to enlist resident involvement in respecting the needs of others, setting and maintaining equitable quiet hours and noise-level standards. Specifically, concensus-seeking, win-win vs. win-lose, creative problem-solving, negotiation training might be valuable;

d. Change (manipulate) the environment to help meet students' needs. Adding carpeting would be a possibility worth investigating (see students' comments on adding carpeting in Section 4, question 7);

e. At all levels seek to develop a spirit of community among residents. In the large halls this may mean focusing on a floor-wide rather than hall-wide basis.

2. Regarding alcohol, the Department of Residence Living should:

a. Utilize, if possible, the resources and research of the Alcohol Studies unit on campus to determine the extent of use and abuse of alcohol in university residence halls;

b. Conduct additional informal research in residence halls regarding reasons for dissatisfaction with the current alcoholic beverage use policy;

c. Make available the widest variety of programs and resource persons on alcohol abuse to residence hall staff and residents.

3. Regarding other drugs, the Department of Residence Living should:

a. Conduct further research, formal and informal, regarding the reason(s) for high dissatisfaction rate in COED halls;

b. Seek to determine the reasons for drug use within the environment.

4. Regarding visitation, the Department of Residence Living should continue to review and promote reasonable and developmental alternatives to the current all-encompassing visitation policy, at least on an experimental basis.

TABLE 4

UNIVERSITY AND RESIDENCE HALL POLICIES

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondents	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
How appropriate are the rules and policies of your residence hall for the following?						
67. Noise						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	33	19	40	35	31.2	34.0
Undecided	8	6	10	7	10.4	5.8
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	59	74	49	58	58.4	60.2
68. Alcohol						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	37	21	42	41	45.4	30.8
Undecided	10	11	10	9	10.6	9.3
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	53	68	48	50	44.0	59.9
69. Other Drugs						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	19	12	25	9	24.7	14.8
Undecided	16	19	18	12	16.1	15.0
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	64	67	55	75	59.2	70.2

TABLE 4--Continued

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
70. Visitation						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	26	26	26	26	24.7	27.3
Undecided	6	6	9	6	6.9	6.4
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	67	66	64	68	68.4	66.3
64. Rate the study atmosphere in your residence hall.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	38	22	47	39	37.8	37.6
Undecided	4	4	5	4	6.1	2.7
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	58	74	47	57	56.1	59.7
94. Rate the noise level in the area in which you live.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	40	28	50	39	42.2	38.7
Undecided	9	7	10	9	10.5	8.2
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	51	62	38	50	47.3	53.1

4. HOUSING: FACILITIES, MAINTENANCE, VENDING, SERVICES

Regarding the preferability of off-campus housing (question 10), the two most salient observations are (1) that one third of those responding indicated they would rather live in residence halls, and (2) the larger (38) percentage of students who are undecided regarding residential living. Quite possibly, one or a combination of decisions/events could sway students toward or away from residential living. Examples are: cancelling the "Freshman Rule," increasing programming, increasing the severity and breadth of policies and their control, and overcrowding the residence halls.

Carpeting rooms (question 7) takes precedence over all other types of renovations or remodeling in residence halls. There was virtually no difference between type of hall. Students in COED halls apparently desired a more complete "remodeling" of rooms as a second choice, while painting rooms was a distinct second choice for those living in S.S.S. halls.

Seventy-three per cent of respondents indicated that requirements for personal security were satisfactory, while a slightly fewer number felt the security requirements for private property (questions 96, 95) were being met. More respondents seemed to feel that a "night patrol" would help meet security requirements (question 9). With the exception of the COED halls, the fact that 27% of the respondents in other types of halls felt that a night patrol would help may be worth considering increasing campus police patrols in those specific areas where a need could be identified. This is even more salient when another 20% of the respondents were undecided as to the need for such a patrol.

Respondents seemed to have more definite opinions regarding adequacy of living spaces than for the above area of security. More COED, followed by L.S.S. respondents were dissatisfied with adequacy for studying (34% and 24%) and sleeping (31% and 18%). However, where a difference might have been expected regarding adequacy for socializing (question 99), no difference between hall types was found. COED halls apparently do not have an advantage where adequacy of living space for socializing is concerned.

Beds, closet space, room lighting, and lounge furniture were all rated less satisfactorily by COED students than those in other housing types. However, responses from students in other hall types regarding closet space, room lighting, and lounge furniture were fairly high (approximately 30% for each type of hall on each kind of furnishing). S.S.S. respondents felt much more strongly (45%) that temperature and ventilation regulation were unsatisfactory; an unsatisfactory response in this area was high for respondents from COED and L.S.S. halls also. Students were much more satisfied with adequacy of study desks and cleanliness of restrooms and laundry rooms.

Quality and quantity of food served in vending machines was generally unsatisfactory except in L.S.S. halls, where a majority of respondents were satisfied. Respondents in all three categories felt the "efficiency" of service was unacceptable.

Responses to question 110, which asks for a rating of the quality of food in dining halls, revealed that only in S.S.S. halls was the quality distinctly satisfactory. In COED halls the quality was rated unsatisfactory by 51%, while respondents from L.S.S. halls had as many who were satisfied as dissatisfied.

Sex of Respondent

More women than men would choose to live in university-owned housing (question 10).

While breakdown by hall type does not reveal glaring differences, considerably more women than men feel their security requirements would be more adequately met if a night patrol were hired (question 9). This is contrasted with responses to question 96, where 71% of the women (75% of the men) felt their security requirements were being met.

Considerably more women than men felt their rooms were adequate for sleeping and socializing; and that their desks were adequate (questions 98, 99, 100). Men were more strongly inclined to believe that their beds were inadequate (question 101), while 45% of the women felt temperature and ventilation regulation was inadequate (question 105).

Women were more satisfied than men regarding the quality of food in the vending machines and in dining hall cafeterias (questions 107, 110), but were generally as dissatisfied as men with quantity of food in vending machines as well as efficiency of the machines (questions 108, 109). This general level of dissatisfaction appears to be unsatisfactory.

Recommendations

1. A variety of possible structural and furnishing alternatives should be reviewed and seriously considered as to increase the likelihood that students will remain in residence halls beyond their freshman year. Possibilities include:

    a. "Specialty" or "interest" halls/floors.

    b. With residents sharing a portion of the costs and labor, the following might be considered:

        1. Remodeling rooms (including individually-painted and decorated rooms).

2. Creating two-room "suites" by putting a passageway between two rooms.

3. Carpeting rooms; allowing residents to pick colors of university-approved carpet.

c. Allow the painting of corridors by residents of a floor.

2. The survey results seem to indicate a need for a night patrol. Further research regarding the viability of a night patrol in the residence hall area is needed. One possible approach might be through a partially RHA-funded patrol, with participating residence halls providing the remainder of funds.

3. Residents of COED halls need to be surveyed in more depth regarding living space needs for studying and sleeping. More informal spaces should be created in all residence hall areas for socializing. Possibilities include:

a. Area coffeehouses.

b. Listening lounges.

c. Redesigning study lounges.

d. Creating more residence hall libraries to allow some study lounges to be used for other purposes.

e. Snack bars in halls.

4. Residents of all hall types (but especially COED halls) need to provide specific reasons for inadequacy of beds, closet space, room lighting, lounge furniture, and room ventilation. Priorities for renovation should be determined by each hall and recommendations submitted to the Housing Office.

5. A thorough study of the university vending machine operation in all residence halls should be undertaken. A Residence Hall Association committee should be charged with the responsibility for gathering information and making final recommendations about improvement of vending operations.

6. A high priority should be given to developing a Food Service Committee which can adequately deal with complaints and suggestions of students regarding food service and food quality. The Director of Housing and Food Service, the Director of Residence Living, and the RHA President should determine the composition, objectives, and ways by which recommendations might be implemented. Differences in satisfaction between various dining halls should be studied.

TABLE 5

HOUSING: FACILITIES, MAINTENANCE, VENDING, SERVICES

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
10. Would you rather live in off-campus housing if available?						
Yes	33.3	32	36	32	33.8	33.2
Undecided	38.1	27	31	27	30.3	26.8
No	28.1	41	32	40	35.9	40.0
7. If the following were offered or available, which one would you choose?						
Paint room	11.4	21	5	10	10.3	12.2
Movable furniture	13.6	8	12	16	12.7	14.3
Remodel rooms	18.5	11	29	16	20.7	17.0
Carpet rooms	46.8	48	45	46	44.0	48.7
CCTV	9.6	10	8	10	12.3	7.8

TABLE 5--Continued

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
Rate the degree to which requirements for security are being met.						
95. Private Property						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	17.2	12	15	20	19.5	15.6
Undecided	13.5	11	15	13	14.1	13.1
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	69.4	74	69	65	66.4	71.3
96. Physical Self						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	13.0	10	12	14	12.0	13.7
Undecided	13.8	11	14	14	12.9	14.4
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	73.2	75	72	70	75.1	71.9
9. Would your requirements for security be more adequately met if a "night patrol" was hired to periodically move through your living area?						
Yes	24.6	27	18	27	13.6	32.5
Undecided	21.8	20	22	23	22.2	21.7
No	53.2	52	59	50	64.2	45.8

Is your living space (your room) adequate for:						
97. Studying						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	25.6	19	34	24	28.7	23.5
Undecided	7.0	5	6	8	8.1	6.2
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	67.3	73	59	67	63.2	70.3
98. Sleeping						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	20.5	12	31	18	25.2	17.3
Undecided	4.6	3	5	5	5.5	3.8
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	74.8	81	63	75	69.3	78.9
99. Socializing						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	25.8	27	26	24	30.8	22.4
Undecided	10.5	12	11	9	11.7	9.6
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	63.7	58	61	65	57.5	68.0
Rate the following in terms of adequacy:						
100. Study Desk						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	16.6	19	22	12	19.8	35.3
Undecided	5.4	6	6	4	6.2	5.4
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	78.1	71	70	81	74.0	59.3

TABLE 5--Continued

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
101. Bed						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	27.7	21	39	24	35.3	22.4
Undecided	4.4	4	5	4	5.4	3.7
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	67.8	72	54	70	59.3	73.9
102. Closet Space						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	32.6	30	39	29	29.4	34.9
Undecided	5.3	5	5	6	7.8	3.5
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	62.0	62	54	64	62.8	61.6
103. Room Lighting						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	35.9	31	43	33	35.0	36.7
Undecided	6.5	5	6	7	10.1	3.8
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	57.6	60	48	58	54.9	59.5
104. Lounge Furniture						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	34.9	30	39	34	35.3	34.6
Undecided	11.9	9	11	13	15.2	9.5
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	53.3	58	48	51	49.5	55.9

105.	Temperature and Ventilation Regulation					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	38.5	45	34	36	29.1	45.4
	Undecided	7.3	8	7	7	9.4	5.9
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	54.1	44	57	54	61.5	48.7
106.	Cleanliness of Restroom and Laundry Rooms					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	14.0	9	20	13	15.4	13.1
	Undecided	5.8	4	8	5	7.0	4.9
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	80.2	84	70	80	77.6	82.0
	Rate the following items about the vending service in your residence hall:					
107.	Quality					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	45.3	53	56	34	48.9	42.7
	Undecided	13.5	13	14	13	15.7	12.0
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	41.2	29	27	51	35.4	45.3
108.	Quantity					
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	43.7	59	55	29	44.9	42.8
	Undecided	13.2	13	13	13	14.2	12.5
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	43.1	24	30	56	40.9	44.7

TABLE 5--Continued

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
109. Efficiency						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	53.8	54	65	45	53.6	54.0
Undecided	14.6	14	13	15	16.4	13.3
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	31.5	28	19	38	30.0	32.7
110. Rate the quality of food in your dining hall cafeteria.						
Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	40.7	21	51	41	49.9	34.1
Undecided	10.3	8	10	11	11.5	9.6
Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	48.9	66	36	45	38.6	56.3

5. FINANCIAL AID AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Hall Type

Approximately 50% of the respondents from all housing types indicated that they were dissatisfied with the degree to which information about various types of financial assistance reached them (question 93). Responses to questions 22, 23, and 25 were expected: one half of the respondents needed financial assistance to pay their way through school; 58% of the respondents stated that the largest proportion of their college expenses were paid for by parents, while 28% of the respondents stated that they paid for the largest proportion of their expenses. The financial aids brochures and the Financial Aids office were the two principal information sources for financial aids.

Almost a quarter of the sample was presently employed (question 30), and 40% of those who worked did so 6-10 hours/week (question 31). Respondents from COED and L.S.S. halls who worked did so for a greater number of hours per week than did those from the S.S.S. halls.

On questions related to the availability for employment of respondents and opinions of the overall local job market, differences between hall types was not observed (questions 24, 35). Sixty-eight percent of the total sample rated the local job market unsatisfactory; a substantial majority felt that more part-time jobs should be made available in residence halls and the community (questions 35, 29, and 28). While 52% of the respondents had no difficulty in finding summer employment (36% did have difficulty), 57% would at least "possibly" consider remaining in the

Pullman area during the summer if jobs could be made available locally (questions 26 and 27); 23% of that total sample gave a more positive statement desiring to remain in Pullman if employment was available.

Sex of Respondent

When compared with men, an extremely high percentage of women obtained the largest proportion of their college expenses from parents; men were far more self-supporting than women (question 23). While this dependency on parents is fact, women desire to pay more of their own way through school. Approximately the same number of women as men were employed (question 30), work the same number of hours/week (question 31), and are available for the same number of hours/week as are men (question 24). Women felt much more strongly than men that more jobs should be available in the community and in residence halls (questions 29, 28). Many more women than men (40.7% compared with 29.3%) had difficulty in acquiring summer employment (question 26).

Women, more than men, responded to question 93 that they were dissatisfied with the information received regarding types of financial assistance (55.3% compared with 49.8%).

Recommendations

1. Ways should be found to reach more students, both on-campus and off-campus, with information about various types of and deadlines for financial aid. Possibilities include:

   a. More extensive use of the Daily Evergreen.

   b. More extensive use of The Pullman Herald.

   c. Utilization of residence hall government and staff to disseminate information.

   d. Information sessions and programs about financial aids for residence hall staffs.

e. Use of KWSU radio and television.

f. Possibly lists of part-time jobs published and distributed to residence halls.

2. The need for an active student employment clearinghouse is very great, both for academic year and summer employment. Means by which information from potential employees can be sought and means by which employment information can reach students on a campus-wide basis should be reviewed and strengthened.

3. It might be worthwhile to review the feasibility of creating a new position within the Office of Student Affairs with two major responsibilities: (1) coordinator for off-campus housing and (2) student employment clearinghouse. The duties of this position would be broad, from providing information to research and possible programming activities.

4. Explore the possibility of more work-study positions within the residence halls--i.e., publicity, mail clerks, night patrol.

5. Focus more heavily than what is being done at present on needs of women to become employed and more self-sufficient. Given the responses to these questions, it might be wise to establish a panel or committee to make more substantive input to the Financial Aids office and the Student Affairs office regarding the needs of women.

TABLE 6

FINANCIAL AID AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
22. Do you need financial assistance to pay your way through school?						
Yes	49.6	49.9	51.8	47.5	48.4	50.8
Undecided	14.1	12.9	14.5	14.2	16.4	12.6
No	35.8	33.6	32.9	37.6	35.2	36.6
23. The largest proportion of your college expenses are paid for by:						
Parents	52.5	50.1	51.8	52.1	39.9	61.0
Self	28.2	27.7	25.9	29.3	41.3	18.9
Loan	3.4	5.0	2.5	3.0	2.9	3.7
Financial Assistance	7.3	6.7	9.4	6.3	6.7	7.8
Grant or Scholarship	8.8	9.2	9.4	8.2	9.2	8.6
25. What principal source did you use to obtain financial aid information?						
Financial Aids Office	24.0	21.1	22.9	17.3	25.9	22.8
Catalog	17.7	12.6	13.7	15.6	22.9	14.4
Parents	19.3	16.8	14.5	15.9	17.7	20.2

	Faculty	11.3	8.0	10.8	8.9	9.2	12.6
	Financial Aid Brochure	27.7	23.2	21.2	23.0	24.3	30.0
93.	Rate the degree to which you receive information regarding the various types of financial assistance; such as work study, loan programs, etc.						
	Very Unsatisfactory/Unsatisfactory	53.0	49	54	51	49.8	55.3
	Undecided	22.1	20	20	22	25.6	19.6
	Satisfactory/Very Satisfactory	24.9	26	23	24	24.6	25.1
30.	Are you presently employed?						
	Yes	22	23	21	21	21.3	23.7
	No	77	74	76	76	78.7	76.3
31.	If so, how many hours/week do you work?						
	1-3	13	6	4	3	12.7	12.8
	4-5	21	6	4	7	23.4	19.1
	6-10	40	11	12	12	37.3	41.8
	11-15	13	2	4	4	14.3	12.2
	More than 15	13	4	4	4	12.3	14.1

TABLE 6--Continued

Question Number	Hall Size				Sex of Respondent	
	Hall Size Total	Small Single Sex	COED	Large Single Sex	Male	Female
24. How many hours/week are you available for employment?						
1-5	36	37	35	34	33.4	38.4
6-10	37	32	35	36	36.9	36.4
11-15	17	16	15	18	18.7	16.2
16-20	7	7	8	6	7.6	6.7
More than 20	3	2	3	3	3.4	2.3
35. Rate your overall opinion of the local job market.						
Critical	9	7	9	8	9.1	8.7
Poor	59	54	55	53	58.0	59.9
Adequate	30	27	24	28	30.6	28.9
Good	2	2	2	1	1.6	2.2
Very Good	0.04	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.3
29. Should more part-time jobs be made available in the community?						
Yes	71	70	73	69	64.7	76.0
Undecided	25	24	23	26	28.8	22.2
No	4	3	1	4	6.5	1.8

28. Should more part-time jobs be made available in the residence halls?						
Yes	62	64	59	60	50.3	69.8
Undecided	30	28	30	30	36.6	25.5
No	8	11	9	8	13.1	4.7
26. Do you have difficulty in acquiring summer employment?						
Yes	36	37	35	35	29.3	40.7
Undecided	12	10	11	13	13.4	11.1
No	52	50	53	51	57.3	48.2
27. If more jobs could be made available locally, would you consider remaining in the Pullman area during the summer?						
No, not at all	44	41	42	45	41.8	44.7
Possibly	34	35	33	33	32.8	34.2
Yes	15	13	15	15	15.7	13.8
Definitely yes	8	9	10	7	9.7	7.3

DISCUSSION

The results of this survey give the Department of Residence Living, the Residence Hall Association and each residence hall staff and government a better picture of students' perceptions of their residence hall and certain aspects of the campus environment. Each hall can find much in this report upon which to ponder, discuss, and hopefully, act. Certainly, much of the burden for action falls upon the individual Head Resident and hall government. The Department of Residence Living as well as other affiliated student affairs agencies, i.e., Financial Aids, need to communicate and cooperate more fully.

Recommendations herein can be viewed as either strong suggestions for action or as points of departure for additional discourse. They are not meant to be all-inclusive, but should provide some fairly specific guidance about steps that might be taken to meet students' needs. Among the most urgent are:

1. Develop strong student governments in residence halls; the Department of Residence Living should consider ways whereby hall governments can be developed into stronger, more viable working groups;

2. Consider immediately ways that women can receive equal recreational and financial aid/employment benefits when compared with those received by men;

3. Review the residence hall physical plant and make realistic recommendations for changing the physical environment;

4. Attempt to determine ways that vending and dining hall quality of food can be improved;

5. Give a high priority to finding ways that students can obtain help in working through their personal problems inside or outside the residential environment.

The recommendation for a follow-up assessment of students' needs and perceptions is almost too obvious to mention. When undertaken, the following general framework is suggested:

Develop Plan of Action
Generate Goals
Validate Goals
Rank Goals
Prepare Performance Indicators
Identify Assessment Tools
Set Criterion Levels for Groups and Tests
Collect Data
Analyze Data for Discrepancies
Determine Probable Reason(s) for Discrepancies.

While not followed to the letter, this general "flow" was followed. Consulting across units within the Student Affairs Division, as well as utilizing general university expertise, must be used to make any future Needs Assessment activity as productive as possible.